1

2

3

4   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5   NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6

7   LAUREN HUGHES, et al.,   Case No. 22-cv-07668-VC   (TSH)

8   Plaintiffs,
                                                     DISCOVERY ORDER
9   v.
                                                     Re: Dkt. No. 180
10   APPLE, INC.,

11   Defendant.

12

13   The parties have a dispute about Plaintiffs' redactions to their medical records. To help the

14   Court better understand the practicalities of the dispute, the Court ordered the parties to submit ten

15   examples of the redacted medical records for *in camera* review, five chosen by Plaintiffs and five

16   chosen by Apple. ECF No. 185.

17   The Court has now reviewed the examples, and doing so has been quite illuminating. The

18   examples total hundreds of pages and imply that the total volume of medical records at issue in the

19   case is enormous. Each redaction, of course, is individual, made to one portion of a document.

20   Except for Apple Exhibit 4, the redactions Plaintiffs have made in the examples submitted are

21   quite restrained. It's obvious that careful thought went into these redactions, and these redactions

22   do not look like an effort to conceal relevant evidence. In context, sometimes you can tell the

23   particular reason for a redaction, but many times you can't just from looking at the redacted

24   document, and the redaction log usually says that the redaction concerns a physical condition for

25   which emotional distress is not a recognized symptom, or alternatively, medication or treatment

26   not prescribed for emotional distress and/or prescribed for physical condition for which emotional

27   distress is not a recognized symptom.

28   Having reviewed these examples *in camera*, the Court has come to the conclusion that the

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1   level of detail Apple seeks for each redaction is completely infeasible. As a purely academic

2   matter, if you just thought about it in the abstract, Apple's request for "(1) Plaintiff-specific

3   showings for each redaction; (2) contextual explanations demonstrating why the redacted

4   information is not directly related to the mental conditions placed at issue; and (3) sufficient

5   identifying information to allow Apple to assess the propriety of Plaintiffs' redactions" might

6   seem logical. But this collapses under the weight of reality when you realize the volume of

7   redactions and medical records at issue. Further, this is not like a privilege log where every entry

8   is either privilege, work product, or both. The explanations Apple is demanding would be specific

9   to each redaction and would presumably consist of information substantiating why the redacted

10 material is not relevant to the medical conditions each Plaintiff put at issue by filing suit.

11   This is an unjustifiable amount of work. Discovery is supposed to be proportional to the

12 needs of the case, *see* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(b)(1), and sometimes the Court's job is to declare that

13 perfection isn't worth it. This is one of those times, and Apple's motion to compel is therefore

14 **DENIED**.

15   **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16

17 Dated: November 10, 2025

18   _____

19   THOMAS S. HIXSON
                                                            United States Magistrate Judge

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28